



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Application Number	Filing Date	First Named Applicant	Attorney Docket Number
09/339,818	06/25/99	Davis	038134-50010

Examiner
L. E. Crane

Art Unit	Paper No.
1623	13

DATE MAILED: n/a

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel)

- (1) Mr. Jeffrey A. Lindeman (3) --
(2) Examiner L. E. Crane (4) --

Date of Interview: May 3, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy given to) ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: See attachment.

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some of all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached

Claim(s) discussed: See page 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: See page 2.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment:
See page 2.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would be allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 713.04) If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, the completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

PTOL-413 (amended 4/4/97)

09/339,818 - P. N. 13 - Intv. Summary

COPY FOR ☒ File

Continued on next page -->>

☐ Applicant

Serial No. 09/339,818

2

Art Unit 1623

INTERVIEW SUMMARY(cont.)

Claims discussed: Independent claims in particular.

Identification of prior art discussed: "Moser" references:.. WO99/24474 and Ruebner et al. , "Dimeric Cyclodextrin Carriers with High Binding Affinity to Porphyrinoid Photosensitizers." Journal of Inclusion Phenomena and Molecular Recognition in Chemistry, 27, 69-84 (1997)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: Applicant was called after the personal interview of the previous day to convey the two citations noted above. Examiner indicated that applicant would probably find the references very important and that the introduction of provisos into independent claims to exclude the disclosed subject matter might be well advised.



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Application Number	Filing Date	First Named Applicant	Attorney Docket Number
09/339,818	06/25/99	Davis	038134-50010

Examiner
L. E. Crane

Art Unit	Paper No.
1623	12

DATE MAILED: * n/a

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel)

(1) Mr. Jeffrey A. Lindeman

(4) Examiner L. E. Crane

(2) Ms. Christine S-A. Lee

(5) Examiner Gary Geist, SPE

(3) Ms. Elizabeth C. Weimar

(6) Examiner Paula Hutzell, Biotech Specialist

Date of Interview: May 2, 2001

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy given to) ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: See attachment.

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some of all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached

Claim(s) discussed: See page 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: See page 2.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment:
See page 2.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would be allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 713.04) If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, the completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

PTOL-413 (amended 4/4/97)

09/339,818 - P. N. 12 - Intv. Summary

COPY FOR ☒ Fil

Continued on next page -->>

☐ Applicant

Serial No. 09/339,818

2

Art Unit 1623

INTERVIEW SUMMARY(cont.)

Claims discussed: All claims remaining of record, original claims 1 and 4, specifically.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bachman and Tabushi references.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: Applicant agreed that confusion concerning species/genus relationships could be effectively addressed by formulating a separate independent claim wherein ring-opened cyclodextrins are specifically described. Examiner agreed that this kind of division of subject matter would probably render the prior art rejections moot. It was suggested that changes in claims could be made to make clear that the subject matter intended to be claimed was directed to cell-targeted ligand modified cyclodextrins.

Claims for discussion at May 2, 2001 Interview

1. A linear cyclodextrin copolymer comprising substituted or unsubstituted, cyclodextrin moieties bifunctionally bound in the linear copolymer backbone, through the number 2, 3, or 6 position of at least one glucopyranose ring of the cyclodextrin, to divalent moieties linking the cyclodextrins of the linear cyclodextrin polymer.
2. A linear cyclodextrin copolymer of claim 1, wherein at least one glucopyranose ring of at least one cyclodextrin moiety is an oxidized glucopyranose ring.

Claims not for entry into application—for discussion purposes only